

1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

3

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4

5 VERONICA GUTIERREZ, ERIN WALKER  
6 and WILLIAM SMITH, as individuals and  
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

7

## Plaintiffs.

No. C 07-05923 WHA

8

9 || WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,

10 || Defendant.

**ORDER RE PARAGRAPH 9 OF  
JANUARY 30 ORDER**

10

11

12 Paragraph 9 of the January 30 order required that Wells Fargo “provide a declaration  
13 setting forth completely all time expended by it on same or on similar projects,” if it contends that  
14 any item or project was excessive (Dkt. No. 619). This means that if Wells Fargo objects to any  
15 line item for which class counsel seek fees, then Wells Fargo must supply the amount it spent on  
16 that project or task. The word “excessive” includes items that Wells Fargo believes are not  
17 necessarily too much but also inappropriate, which really boils down to the same thing; namely, it  
18 would be excessive for counsel to recover for that line item. To the extent that Wells Fargo has  
19 failed to comply with the January 30 order, the Court is inclined to accept at face value class  
20 counsel’s submission as to the dollar amount sought for recovery (without prejudice to any  
21 reduction the Court makes on its own). Nevertheless, this order gives Wells Fargo another  
22 opportunity to comply with paragraph 9 of the January 30 order. This must be done by  
23 **MARCH 26 AT NOON**. This should moot class counsel’s pending letter (Dkt. No. 655) but this  
24 order notes that this is not a discovery dispute. This should have been set forth in a normal  
25 motion, not as a three-page application.

26

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

27

28 || Dated: March 23, 2015

Wm. Alsup  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE